This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

PROPERTY OF
University of Michigan Libraries
1817
ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

THE

WAGE-WORKER'S

REMEDY

BY

MORGAN E. DOWLING,

AUTHOR OF

"SOUTHERN PRISONS, OR JOSIE, THE HEROINE OF FLORENCE,"
"REASON AND INGERSOLLISM," AND "THREE
STEPS IN LIFE."

DETROIT:
John F. Eby & Co., Publishers.
1894.

HV
8572
.D75

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1894,

BY MORGAN E. DOWLING,

In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

General Library
LABADIE
COLLECTION
10-9-52

To the Memory

of

MARIA JOSEPHINE DOWLING,

My Beloved Mother,

from whose lips I first heard the words

Liberty, Justice, Humanity,

this volume

is respectfully dedicated.

INTRODUCTION.

"All wealth is the product of labor."

The object of this little work is to promote the cause of American labor; to present to the American people a general view of the situation between labor and capital; to demonstrate that enforced idleness and low wages are the leading causes of the wage-worker's destitution; to point out the chief sources of all our labor troubles, and disclose the means to abolish them; to enumerate the wage-worker's wants, and propose legislative measures that will afford relief; to indicate that

organization and legislation are the only safeguards upon which the wage-workers can build their hopes, and the only means that will enable them to accomplish their ends; to disprove the theory that poverty is produced by material progress; to refute the absurd idea that there is a complete remedy for poverty, and to suggest the means by which poverty may be reduced to a minimum, and all the evils that environ labor may be abated.

MORGAN E. DOWLING.

DETROIT, March 1st, 1894.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

INTRODUCTION..... 5

CHAPTER I.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR..... 9

CHAPTER II.

THE WAGE-WORKER'S WANTS..... 24

1. Steady Work.
2. Shorter Hours.
3. Fair Wages.

CHAPTER III.

LEGISLATION THE WAGE-WORKER'S REMEDY..... 31

I. Suspend All Immigration to this Country... 36

II. Make Eight Hours a Legal Day's Work..... 52

III. Prohibit Marriage Under the Age of Twenty-One Years..... 63

IV. Prohibit the Employment of Children Under Fifteen Years of Age, in Workshops, Factories, and Mines..... 65

V. Fix the Minimum Rate of Wages at Two Dollars per Day for All Laborers, Except Domestic and Farm Laborers..... 69

VI. Reduce the Legal Rate of Interest to Four per Cent per Annum..... 107

VII. Purchase All Street Railways and Place Them Under the Control and Management of the Municipal Authorities..... 113

VIII. Purchase All Telegraph, Telephone, and Railroad Lines, and Place Them Under the Control and Management of the National Government..... 116

IX. Prohibit the Purchase of Lands in This Country by Non-Resident Aliens, and Compel All Non-Resident Aliens who Now Own Lands, to Sell Them Within a Specified Time or Forfeit Their Titles..... 122

CHAPTER IV.

THERE IS NO COMPLETE REMEDY FOR POVERTY..... 171

CHAPTER I.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Gulf of Mexico to Lake Superior, in every town and in every city, on mountain top and desert plain, in smiling valley and entangled forest, wherever the human voice is heard or the eye penetrates, the prevalence, utility, power, and pomp of wealth are everywhere visible. Princely stores, palatial homes, marble cathedrals, grand theaters, and stupendous public

buildings—all indicating the wealth and prosperity of the country—meet our vision on every hand. The land is adorned with schools and jeweled with churches. The vaults of countless banks hoard untold millions of treasure. Tens of thousands of granaries, elevators, and warehouses are filled with the bountiful products of farm and field. The supply of copper, iron, coal, salt, lumber, and the innumerable other products of nature, is inexhaustible. The soil is nearly everywhere rich and productive. "And now, where once was howling wilderness and waste, a million fields glow with the golden grain; a million homes crown life with happiness!"

And yet, in this proud land of peace and plenty, exuberant with a superabundance of everything necessary to sustain human life; in the midst of all this wealth, and glitter, and oriental splendor, the gloom of poverty and misery is everywhere apparent. Emaciated women and ragged children saunter through the streets begging for bread. Pale, haggard-looking men and women seek employment in vain, and are driven to madness and suicide daily for the want of work and the necessaries of life. Our almshouses and jails are filled with persons constrained by enforced idleness and extreme poverty to make them their abode. Many of those who obtain

employment can hardly keep body and soul together with the meager compensation they receive for their services and the want of steady work. From the depths of poverty and despair we hear the muttering and murmuring and wailing of the wronged and oppressed. And wherever we find wealth in the greatest abundance, there also will be found the greatest amount of poverty and misery. Everywhere we find capital and labor staring each other in the face like two gladiators, ready to stab each other to death. No matter which way we turn, we find capital and labor intriguing and organizing. Organizing, what for? Who knows? Who

can tell? Everywhere we find the masses restive, dissatisfied, and turbulent. We hear of nothing but labor unions, knights of labor, anti-poverty clubs, land and liberty clubs, labor societies and unions, socialism, communism, boycotts, strikes, lockouts, incendiaries, and labor riots. The land is filled with hypocrisy, dishonesty, and avarice. The rich are rapidly building up an aristocracy—the middle class is quietly disappearing—all the wealth and power of the country center in the hands of a few, and the great masses of the people have already been reduced to commercial and industrial slavery.

If any one believes that this is an exag-

geration of the facts, that it is more imaginary than real, let him read the articles which recently appeared in the *Christian Union*, on the condition of the poor in American cities, and be convinced of its truth. It is only a short time ago that the Hon. D. M. Evans, an ex-miner and member of the Legislature from Luzerne county, Pa., told the Congressional committee who were investigating the cause of the miners' strike at Reading, "that the condition of the men in the mining region was pitiable in the extreme. That under the store system and the present rate of wages, they *could not get enough to eat and wear.*" This is merely an ex-

ample of the condition of affairs that exist pretty much all over the country. There are forty thousand tenement houses in New York city, occupied by more than a million tenants. It is only a short time since a legislative committee reported that there existed in Chicago alone, nine hundred sweat-shops, with girls working in them sixty hours for seventy-five cents. And every city has its slums, overcrowded by degraded men and women. If any one doubts these facts, let him read what Mr. J. W. Sullivan has to say upon the subject in his "Political Aspects of the Labor Problem," published in a recent work entitled "Factors in American Civilization."

The evidence is not only abundant, but indisputable and decisive.

These are the things—the sights and scenes that turn our civilization and progress into a farce and a curse; that destroy good government; that disorganize society and cause religion to blush with shame. It is this condition of things "that crowds human beings into noisome cellars and squalid tenement houses; that fills prisons and brothels; that goads men with want and consumes them with greed; that robs women of the grace and beauty of perfect womanhood; that takes from little children the joy and innocence of life's morning;" that turns love into

hatred; that provokes man against man; that fills the earth with sighs and groans, with weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth; that imbitters the heart of man, hardens his conscience, deprives life of its sunshine and joys, destroys happiness, produces anguish and tears and melancholy, fires the soul of man with desperation, and impels him to acts of cruelty and desolation.

And what does all this signify? People look calmly on and wonder what it means, and ask when and how it is all going to end. It means that we are in the midst of a political revolution. It means that labor is organizing to assert

its rights. It means that there is going to be an accounting between the workers and the shirkers. It means that hypocrisy is to be unveiled; that the men who rob labor six days in the week, and on the seventh go to church and thank the Lord for their success and prosperity, are to be exposed. It means better laws, better protection and a better government. It means the emancipation of those who toil for their bread. It means steady work and higher wages. It means that the wrongs of the masses must be remedied—peaceably if possible, if not, then by the sovereign power that sits upon nature's throne to enforce the rights of

man. It means that if the poor have no right to the property of the rich, the rich have no right to confiscate the property of the poor. It means that the idle shall not fatten upon the stolen products of labor. It means that men shall not be allowed to accumulate millions in a few years by stealth and oppression. It means that capital shall not be permitted to absorb the entire products of labor, except just enough to keep labor alive that it may keep on producing. It means that people who never worked a day or earned a dollar in their lives shall not be permitted to buy and hold large tracts of land for the purpose of

speculating on the necessities of their fellow-men, and grow rich at their expense. It means that the products of labor must be more equitably distributed. It means that the weak shall not be devoured by the strong. It means that in this fair land of liberty and plenty, every man, woman, and child, shall be comfortably clothed and fed, and that those who toil shall enjoy the wealth they create, and have some little time to cultivate their social, moral, and intellectual faculties.

It is time that capital paused to think. It stands upon a precipice. There is a deep abyss below. It had better take

warning, for the day of retribution is near at hand. "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly fine." The hour has come when the masses of the people are determined to have redress for their wrongs and oppressions—by legislation, if possible—if not, then by the means prescribed by the Declaration of Independence! And that is what all these organizations and these movements and counter-movements, strikes and lock-outs and turmoils and troubles mean. The handwriting is on the wall, and the sooner the fact is recognized the better for all concerned.

In the organization of labor there is

hope. In unity there is strength. False guides, incompetent and envious leaders, and the jealousies born of ambition, may occasionally check the labor movement, or temporarily divert it from its natural and legitimate course; but it will still go forward, like the mighty stream that rushes on, notwithstanding the eddies and whirlpools that gather in its bosom to impede its progress. Already, millions of organized wage-workers clamor for right and justice. Something must be done. This mad condition of things cannot go on forever. Fate and the eternal laws of natural justice have so decreed!

Some folks may think this is pretty

strong language. Perhaps it is. But the occasion requires it. If labor is to be heard at all, it must speak in thundering tones, and words of fire! The people have been slumbering so long, that strong words are necessary to arouse them to a sense of duty.

CHAPTER II.

THE WAGE-WORKER'S WANTS.

1.—STEADY WORK.
2.—SHORTER HOURS.
3.—FAIR WAGES.

"Every want that stimulates the breast,
Becomes a source of pleasure when redressed."

Having indicated the situation between capital and labor, the question naturally arises what are the causes that have induced this status of affairs?

The impoverished condition of the wage-workers to-day is due chiefly to two causes—*enforced idleness, and low wages.*

All the labor riots, all the strikes, all

the boycotts, and all the lock-outs that have ever taken place in this country, were actuated either directly or indirectly, by a difference of opinion between capital and labor on two questions:

1. As to the number of hours that should constitute a day's work.

2. As to the rate of wages to be paid per day.

These are the questions that have instigated all the troubles between capital and labor in the past, and that are likely to renew those troubles in the future. One of the purposes for which labor was organized was to adjust these questions, but they have not been settled. And

there will be neither peace nor harmony between capital and labor until they are. How, then, are they to be adjusted? What do the wage-workers want? The wage-workers want three things—steady work, shorter hours, and fair wages. These are the essential wants of the wage-workers. They are simple, reasonable, perpetual, and indispensable. Give these three things to the wage-workers and the labor problem is solved.

Every man has the same right to live and work that he has to think and breathe. These are natural rights. They come from God. They are indisputable, inalienable, supreme! Provide the wage-

worker with steady employment; reduce his hours of labor to eight hours per day; pay him a fair and just compensation for his services, and all the contentions between capital and labor will vanish like snow before an April's sun. And all these things can be given to labor by appropriate legislation. These three things are all that the wage-workers want. They are all that the wage-workers can ever expect to obtain. To ask for anything more would be unreasonable. And where is the man who would not give these things to the wage-workers if he possessed the power? If these three things will satisfy the wage-workers, restore peace

and amity, and put an end to all further antagonism between capital and labor, why not grant them? Would it be anything more than fair and just to do so? And is it not clear that if these things were conceded to the wage-workers, that the wage-workers would then have no grounds for complaint; that all labor troubles would cease, and that peace and prosperity would inevitably prevail?

The wage-workers who have steady work, reasonable hours, and good wages, are not complaining. It is the idle. Those who cannot find work; those who are reduced to poverty for the want of work; those who are worked long hours

on wages that are barely sufficient to enable them to live, and those who are not paid in proportion to the value of the services rendered.

The wrongs of the wage-workers are not to be avenged, they must be amicably adjusted. The wage-workers must find redress for all their grievances in the law. When their rights are established by statute, it will be an easy matter to vindicate them. Legislation is the true remedy for all the burdens that oppress labor. And the remedy is one that will meet with the hearty approval of every good citizen. And why? Because it will put to rest all further contention between

capital and labor, by methods that are at once peaceful, just and efficacious.

Having specified the causes of labor's destitution; having pointed out the sources that have led to all our labor troubles; having set forth the wants of labor; and having alleged that the remedy for all these evils is to be found in appropriate legislation, it simply remains for me to designate the legislation necessary to abate them.

CHAPTER III.

LEGISLATION THE WAGE-WORKER'S REMEDY.

"All the space between my mind and the mind of God is full of truths, waiting to be crystallized into law for the benefit of the masses."

In the very nature of things, it is impossible for a man who toils for a living to dwell in idleness. He must labor in order that he may live. It is not work that kills men, it is the worry and poverty produced by enforced idleness. In a great and bountiful country like this, every man who is willing to work ought to be able to find something to do. And yet, tens

of thousands of able-bodied men saunter about our streets in mid-summer, unable to obtain employment. The hours of labor, as a rule, are considerably too long, and wages generally are altogether too low. The cause of this deplorable state of affairs must be apparent even to the casual observer. What is the cause? The cause is that the supply of labor exceeds the demand. In other words, there is not work enough for all who want work, and, consequently, some must remain idle, while those who do work must quietly submit to the terms and conditions imposed by capital. What is the remedy? The remedy is twofold: First, the supply of labor

must be diminished, and second, the demand for labor must be increased. And how is this to be done? This can be accomplished by proper legislation, the natural panacea for all the grievances of the wage-worker. Amend the Constitution of the United States so as to authorize Congress to enact laws for the following purposes, and there will soon be steady work, shorter hours, and fair wages, for every wage-worker in the land:

1. The suspension of all immigration to this country.

2. The making of eight hours a legal day's work.

3. The prohibition of marriage under the age of twenty-one years.

4. The prohibition of the employment of children under fifteen years of age in workshops, factories and mines.

5. The fixing of the minimum rate of wages at two dollars per day for all laborers, except domestic and farm laborers.

6. The reduction of the legal rate of interest to four per cent per annum.

7. The purchase of all street railways and the placing of them under the control and management of the municipal authorities.

8. The purchase of all telegraph, telephone and railroad lines in the United

States, and the placing of them under the control and management of the national government.

9. The prohibition of the purchase of lands in this country by non-resident aliens, and the compelling of all non-resident aliens who now own lands to sell them within a specified time or forfeit their titles.

Congress already possesses the power to suspend immigration, and the several State Legislatures have ample authority to empower the cities to purchase the street railways and run them.

Let us now briefly consider the ultimate effect of the legislation proposed,

and the benefits to be derived therefrom by labor, taking up each of the foregoing propositions in the order in which they are specified.

I.—Suspend Immigration.

If all immigration to this country was prohibited, there would be work for tens of thousands more men and women every year. Statistics show that over six hundred and twenty-three thousand people immigrated to this country last year. Over five hundred and sixty thousand came here the year before, and over five millions have come here in the last decade, and immigration is steadily on

the increase. We have excluded the Chinese, we have prohibited the importation of contract labor, then why not prohibit all immigration, and be done with it? This is what we will have to do ultimately. Then why not do it at once? The condition of the masses, the low price of labor, and two millions of unemployed men and women peremptorily demand that all further immigration be stopped.

During the last year over seventy-three thousand paupers were supported in our poorhouses, and nearly forty-six thousand tramps wandered through our streets begging for bread. The State of Michigan alone supported in its poorhouses, during

the year 1890, over four thousand nine hundred paupers. It maintained outside of its poorhouses, in the same year, over three thousand four hundred paupers, and afforded temporary relief to over thirty-seven thousand people, at a total cost of nearly eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars. During the month of July, 1893, the city of Detroit—as prosperous a city as there is in the country—supplied two-hundred and twenty families, or eight hundred and eighty persons, with provisions, at a cost of nine hundred and seventy-nine dollars. In December, 1893, the Secretary of the Poor Commission of Detroit reported to the Mayor of the

city that the annual appropriation of fifty thousand dollars for the relief of the poor had been expended; that four thousand families—twenty thousand persons—would have to be supported for the remainder of the winter, and that two hundred and fifty thousand dollars would have to be raised for that purpose. During the same month a special committee reported that twenty-five thousand men in Detroit were then idle. In West Bay City one thousand men were reported to be out of work and in absolute want. A committee appointed to visit the Upper Peninsula, reported that there were six thousand people in Gogebic county, and

two thousand in Dickinson county, who must have relief or starve. The committee appealed to the public for assistance, and asked for one hundred thousand dollars to carry these people through the winter; and Governor Rich issued two proclamations to the people of the State, soliciting contributions for the relief of the needy. The State Labor Commissioner reports, that from September 1, 1893, to February 1, 1894, two thousand and sixty-six factories, situated in various parts of the State, were inspected and canvassed for information regarding the number of men unemployed; and that three hundred and seventy-seven of the two thousand

and sixty-six factories, including some of the largest and most important in the State, were idle; that five hundred and seventy-two of them were running on short time; that the average reduction in wages was about ten per cent, and that forty-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty-two of the men who worked in these factories were laid off. And the situation in Michigan is simply a fair illustration of the condition of things all over the country. Professor McCook estimates that the tramps of this country alone cost the people over nine millions a year to support them, "a half more than the cost of the Indian Department, and one-half the

cost of our navy." And it is said that we are losing more every day through the enforced idleness of the people than it cost to put down the rebellion at its most expensive period.

The only objection raised against putting an end to immigration is one founded purely upon sentiment, namely, that this country constitutes an asylum for the poor and oppressed—a hospital and poor-house, so to speak, for the paupers of all the rest of the world. It is a well settled maxim that charity begins at home. It is the first duty of every man to provide the necessaries of life for himself and his family. It is the first duty of

every nation to protect its people against enforced idleness and want. This may seem selfish, but it is natural and right. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. To aid and comfort the needy is at all times commendable. But to bring poverty and misery upon our homes by improvidently assisting others, is to be unjust to ourselves and cruel to those whom we love.

Of course, I am well aware of the fact that the moralists view the question of immigration in a different light. They argue that we are all the children of God; that we are all brothers by birth; that God gave the earth to man; that the

earth is common property; that each man has inherited an equal right to use it; "The earth has he given to the children of men;" that no man can be deprived of this right by law or otherwise; that to prohibit further immigration to this country would be an act in derogation of this right; that every man in the world has a natural as well as a hereditary right to settle upon the earth wherever he pleases, and that no man has the power to divest another of this right if he chooses to exercise it in the pursuit of happiness. From a moral standpoint this view of the question may be sound. It may also be just. Theoretically it seems to be reason-

able. My objection to it is, that it is not practicable. And this is the reason why the idea has neither grown nor been assented to generally. The majority of the people in all ages have rejected it for this reason. The affairs of the world to-day are governed by practical men, and this view of the question they decline to accept, on the ground that it is visionary and of no practical utility.

Congress has enacted laws for the protection of our manufacturers, against the competition of foreign manufacturers, and why? Because foreign manufacturers employ the cheap labor of Europe, and for that reason our manufacturers are unable

to compete with them. This being the case, it logically follows that the object of our protection laws is not to protect our manufacturers against the competition of foreign manufacturers, but against the cheap labor of Europe? Now, if our manufacturers cannot compete with the cheap labor of Europe, in the name of common sense, how are our wage-workers to compete with it? If it is necessary to protect our manufacturers, is it not equally necessary to protect our wage-workers? If capital needs protection, so does labor. Why then protect capital and leave labor unprotected? The cheap labor of Europe is permitted to come here and force down

the price of our labor, and that is all right! But foreign manufacturers are not allowed to come here with cheap goods to force down the price of our goods, because that would be all wrong! In other words, our manufacturers are protected against the cheap labor of Europe, while our wage-workers are obliged to compete with it! Is this just to our wage-workers? As between man and man is it right? Why not extend to our wage-workers the same protection we afford to our manufacturers? If our manufacturers are to be protected in the sale of their commodities against foreign competition, why not protect our wage-workers in the sale of their

commodities (labor) against foreign competition? Is it because our wage-workers have no rights which our law-makers are bound to respect? Is it right to enrich our manufacturers at the expense of our wage-workers? Our manufacturers are protected, first, against the cheap labor of Europe, and second, against high-priced labor in this country, by permitting the cheap labor of Europe to come here and force the price of our labor down. Thus it will be seen, that while our manufacturers are protected against the cheap labor of Europe and high-priced labor in this country, our wage-workers are not protected at all! Evidently Goldsmith

was not far out of the way when he exclaimed:

"Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law."

Our manufacturers are further protected against high-priced labor in this country by the establishment of immigration bureaus in the several States. These bureaus have expended large sums of money to induce immigrants to come here, ostensibly to develop the country, but in reality to cheapen and degrade American labor for the benefit of our manufacturers.

Our manufacturers believe it is all right for them to resort to every possible means to protect themselves against *their* competitors, but as soon as the wage-workers

attempt by the same methods to protect themselves against *their* competitors, our manufacturers object at once. When our wage-workers ask that immigration to this country be stopped, our manufacturers protest, and say that such a thing is not practicable; that it would be a great mistake; that to stop all immigration would be equivalent to building a Chinese wall around us, and would bring commercial and industrial ruin upon the country.

In his "Political Aspects of the Labor Problem," Mr. Sullivan says: "Secretary Evans, of the American Federation of Labor, recently told me that in the course of the year, in all the unions, a third of

the men were more or less out of employment. And Mr. Jos. R. Buchanan, who as economic and exchange editor of the American Press Association has the whole of this country under view, a month ago stated that in his opinion the number of the unemployed would-be workers in America was now two millions." It seems to me that something ought to be done immediately to ameliorate the condition of the poor and oppressed within our own borders if we would save ourselves from disgrace. Is there any charity in inviting people here to starve? This is what we are doing. Is it wise to invite or permit people to come here, when their coming

not only fails to better their condition, but tends to increase the poverty and misery of our own people? Is it not unjust both to those who are here and to those who come here?

II.—Make Eight Hours a Legal Day's Work.

If the hours of labor were reduced, and eight hours made a legal day's work, there would be work for a million of men who at present are unable to find employment. But some will say, why reduce the hours of labor. I will tell you why. The hours of labor in almost every kind

of trade and industry are too long, and should be shortened. Humanity to man, the welfare of society, and the best interests of the country, physically, morally, and intellectually, most emphatically demand shorter hours. The majority of wage-workers rise in the morning at five or six o'clock. They begin their work by doing their chores about the house. They then eat their breakfast and start for their place of employment, and walk, perhaps, one, two, or three miles to reach it. They toil all day. Some amidst the din and hum of machinery, and the dirt and grime and smoke of illy ventilated factories and workshops. Others in the field,

upon the housetop, down in the mines, in cellars and sewers, by the rippling stream and the boisterous sea. When the day's work is done, they walk from one to three miles to their homes. When they arrive it is six or seven o'clock. They are tired and dirty, and wet with perspiration. They eat their supper. Then they do their evening chores. If there is any one ill in the house, they go for the doctor and medicine. It is now eight or nine o'clock. The little ones are going to bed, they embrace them tenderly for a moment, then kiss them good night. A brief chat with their wives completes the daily routine, and they too go to bed, for it is late,

and they must rise early in the morning, perhaps "before the break of day."

Thus it will be seen, these people have no time for recreation, no time for thought, no time to read, no time for physical, moral, or intellectual improvement. Their whole lives are spent in toiling from early morning till late at night. They receive from their employers about as much consideration as they would award to a lot of cattle. And yet these are the very people who support the government in peace and fight its battles when in war. They are the bones and sinews of the nation.

Any system of government that toler-

ates this condition of things is legally and morally wrong. Go out into the street in the morning and evening, when these people are going to and returning from work, and gaze for a moment into their pale, haggard-looking faces. Watch them as they trudge along, men, women, and children, with bent forms, scrawny hands, sunken cheeks and dim eyes—with countenances downcast and so full of sorrow that you cannot help but pity them—and then, gentle reader, ask yourself, as a Christian, is it not time that the hours of labor were reduced? And your conscience and your heart will answer, yes. And nearly all of these people are poorly

fed and illy clad, for their wages simply enable them to live and eke out a miserable existence. Thus they jog along to premature graves, without hope, and without sympathy! Such is life! Such is the dismal and lamentable lot of the millions! Is it strange, or unnatural, or unreasonable, under the circumstances, that these people demand a reduction in the hours of labor? If we were in their place, would we not make the same demand? How can men be expected to improve their situation under such discouraging conditions? If we deprive a man of every means and every opportunity for improvement, in the name of common

sense, how can we expect him to improve? If we reduce him to the status of the brute, how can we expect him to be a man? The fact is, the majority of employers prefer that their workmen should live in ignorance and poverty, because then they are all the more slavish and subservient to their will.

Thirteen States have enacted laws regulating the hours of labor, and have declared that eight hours shall constitute a legal day's work. But not one of these laws are enforced, and why? Because they are unconstitutional. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall pass a law impairing the

obligation of contracts. Hence the necessity of amending the Constitution of the United States so as to authorize Congress to make eight hours a legal day's work in every State in the Union. The Constitution of the Swiss Republic confers authority upon the national legislature to limit the hours of labor, and the people of Switzerland regard it as a wise provision. The eight-hour system, or "Eight-Hour Day" as it is sometimes called, has existed in Australia and New Zealand for nearly half a century.

The demand of the wage-workers for an eight-hour law has been recognized repeatedly by our law-makers, both State and

National, as just and beneficial. Congress only a short time ago passed a statute which provides that eight hours shall constitute a day's work for all laborers, workmen, and mechanics, who may be employed by or on behalf of the Government of the United States. If an eight-hour law is beneficial to those who work for the National Government, would it not be equally beneficial to those who work for the State, individuals, or corporations?

At a large public meeting recently held in London, England, the Hon. Thomas Burns, labor leader and member of Parliament, among other things, offered the

following suggestions for the relief of the unemployed:

1. The introduction of an eight-hour bill, to be taken up as a government measure and pushed through Parliament as rapidly as possible.

2. The government to use every means in its power to induce foreign governments to institute an international eight-hour law. This to stop the foreign competition of long hours.

3. Eight hours to be at once the normal working day in all government establishments, dock-yards, and arsenals, and in all private monopolies, such as rail-

ways and tramways, in which foreign competition does not enter.

When we consider that there are millions of men in this country to-day who are unable to obtain work; that those who are employed work only about eight months in the year; that the number of unemployed are constantly increasing; that the natural accretion to our population is about six hundred thousand a year; that over half a million people immigrate to this country annually, making a total increase in our population of more than a million a year, and that under the new order of things millions of women and boys are hired to do men's work,

thus forcing the men into idleness, it is apparent to even the most obtuse mind that some practical and efficient means that will furnish work to the unemployed must be resorted to without delay. The situation is critical. If we would avoid a crisis, we must adopt heroic measures for the relief of the unemployed immediately.

III.—Prohibit Marriage Under the Age of Twenty-one Years.

To prohibit all persons from marrying under the age of twenty-one years, would prevent the increase of population considerably, and greatly retard the growth of poverty. The ancients determined the

proper age to marry by law. The Romans fixed the age at twenty-five, the Spartans at thirty. Plato thought that no man should marry until he was thirty, while Aristotle believed it was highly improper for a man to marry until he was thirty-seven. But few men under the age of twenty-one are capable of supporting themselves, and precious few are able to provide for a wife and family. Marriages under the age of twenty-one years tend to produce poverty and misery and crime. Thousands of children are brought into the world every year by such marriages, who have to be supported either by the community or the friends or relatives of

the parents. To fix the age of marriage at twenty-one years would keep down the increase of population in this country at least a quarter of a million a year.

IV. — Prohibit the Employment of Children Under Fifteen Years of Age in Workshops, Factories and Mines.

Child labor is regulated in nearly every European country. In France, night-work by children is prohibited under the age of sixteen. In Italy, under twelve. The law of the Netherlands forbids the employment of children in injurious occupations, under sixteen, and child labor un-

der the age of twelve years is prohibited. In Germany, the employment of children under thirteen is forbidden, and children between thirteen and fourteen are not allowed to work more than six hours a day. In Sweden, children under the age of twelve are forbidden to work in factories. In Switzerland, all child labor is prohibited under the age of fourteen years. If all the children under the age of fifteen, who are now employed in mines, factories, and various kinds of workshops, were discharged, their places would furnish employment to thousands of able-bodied men who are now idle. And every one of these children ought to be at school. It

would be a benefit to them, and the nation, if they were. One of the great needs of the country, in every trade and industry, is first-class artisans. We must send these children to school if we expect them to improve in morals and manners and grow up in intelligence, and especially the boys, if we desire to make skillful mechanics of them. Most of the children thus employed are hired simply because they will work for less wages than men. In the positions they occupy they are doing men's work. Women are hired to fill the place of men for the same reason. They do the work of men for much lower wages. This is all wrong. I be-

lieve that in all cases where a woman does a man's work, she should receive a man's wages. The substitution of women and children to do the work of men, constitutes an important factor in the reduction of men's wages, and is the means of throwing thousands of men out of employment every year.

If the women who work in shops and factories were organized into trades-unions they would find it greatly to their advantage.

V.—Fix the Minimum Rate of Wages at Two Dollars Per Day.

I do not believe in paternal rule, but I do believe that it is the duty of every well constituted government to protect its citizens against oppression and want. I believe that two dollars is the lowest sum that should be paid to any man for a legal day's work. It is my firm conviction that no man who lives in this country to-day can support himself and family decently and comfortably the year round on less wages than two dollars per day. The men who are only paid from sixty-five cents to a dollar and a half per day for

their labor, are the men who in times of great commercial and industrial depression deplete the relief funds in our large cities, crowd our almshouses, and precipitate riots for bread. They constitute the great bulk of the poverty-stricken people of the country. These unfortunate men are only employed about eight or nine months in the year, and the mere pittance they receive as wages when they work, scarcely enables them to live, and the moment they are thrown into enforced idleness, want seizes them with the eagerness that a drowning man seizes a straw. The destitution of these impecunious creatures is indeed pitiable. And the saddest

thing of all is that the men who work the hardest are paid the poorest wages. This is a shame and disgrace to our intelligence and our civilization. These men are just as necessary in their sphere as the most skillful mechanics are in theirs. We could not get along without them. Skilled workmen would not perform their work at any price unless they were forced to do so. And for this reason, if no other, they should be paid good wages. I believe that to require a man to work for less than two dollars a day is the worst kind of oppression. And I believe that it is the duty of the National Government to protect its citizens against this

sort of wrong, by enacting a law that will fix the minimum rate of wages at two dollars per day. No man can live decently and comfortably on less, and I believe that every man who toils for a living in this country should receive sufficient remuneration for his labor to enable him to *live like a man!* The law fixes the highest rate of railroad fares, and the highest rate of interest, to prevent oppression. Would it not be just as reasonable to fix the lowest rate of wages? Our cheap labor is unorganized and unable to resist the greed and rapacity of the avaricious. Why then should it not be protected by the strong arm of the law?

If this is not done, it will not be long before this country is overrun with pauper labor. This would be a blot upon the fair escutcheon of the nation. It would be a disgrace and humility to our people. It would cause endless trouble. It would imbitter the poor against the rich, and lead to perpetual strife and bloodshed. Every man who would avert such a calamity, should insist with all the pride and patriotism of a true American, that pauper labor shall not exist in this country, and to prevent such a catastrophe he should demand that no man shall be paid less than two dollars for a legal day's work. In the Vermillion

range, near Duluth, miners are working for eighty cents a day! In Pennsylvania many of the miners are only paid sixty-five cents a day! Think of it! And on this sum they are obliged to support themselves and their families! This is outrageous. It might be tolerated in darkest Africa. It might not be objected to in Japan, China, or India. The peons in Mexico would probably accept sixty-five or eighty cents a day as fair wages. But in free and enlightened America, to offer sixty-five or eighty cents a day to the humblest proletarian is an insult to American labor!

It will be claimed that some men are

capable of doing more work in a day than others, and that every man should be paid according to his merits. This is true, and the men who can do the most work should receive the most pay. What I claim is this, that every man who is able to work, can earn at least two dollars a day, and as this sum is necessary for the comfortable support of himself and family, he should not be paid less for a day's work. The man who earns more should get more. Such a law would not compel any one to hire a man who was incompetent to do a fair day's work, nor would it prevent any man from ob-

taining the highest wages he is able to earn.

I believe that the labor question is a purely national question; that all the issues involved are national issues, and that it is the imperative duty of the National Government to see that suitable laws are enacted by Congress to protect labor against oppression; and that it is the function of the people to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to confer the power upon Congress to enact such laws.

We are living in a progressive and intelligent age, and I believe the time has come when the Constitution of the Uni-

ted States should be amended so as to authorize Congress to pass a law fixing the minimum rate of wages to be paid for a legal day's work. Such a law would protect the poor against the rich, and the weak against the strong. It would prevent the rich from taking advantage of the necessities of the poor. And while it would not reduce the profits of capital, it would increase the income of the wage-worker. Capital can adjust itself to the price of labor without loss, but the wage-worker cannot. In my opinion the enactment of such a law would not only be reasonable and just and humane, but it is an absolute necessity.

Product-sharing, profit-sharing, co-operative production, and many other systems have been suggested to take the place of the present system of paying wages. The system of product-sharing does very well as far as it goes, but it is restricted to a few lines of business, such as fishing, farming and mining. It is not practicable to apply it to manufacturing and other kinds of business. The system of co-operative production has proved a lamentable failure wherever it has been tried. And the system of profit-sharing has not been thoroughly tested. After a careful examination of the various systems offered as substitutes for the wage

system, I have been forced to the conclusion that the present system of paying wages is not only the most satisfactory to wage-workers, but the most practical solution of the wage question. Men who work for a living cannot afford to take any risk. They prefer to sell their labor at a stipulated sum to be paid on a certain day. They then know what they are doing and what they can depend upon. Profit-sharing and product-sharing are uncertainties. It seems to me that the best system for labor is to fix the minimum rate of wages by law, at two dollars per day, and then leave every man free to

contract for as much more as his services will command.

The question will be asked, is not labor, like flour and wheat, a *commodity*, the value of which is regulated by the supply and demand? In a certain sense it is, but common sense and common decency say it is not! If a man has flour to sell, and he cannot obtain his price for it, he can eat it. But if a man has labor to sell, and he cannot obtain his price for it, he must take what he can get or starve! A sack of flour simply represents so much wheat. Labor represents a *human being!* Mark the distinction, bear it well in mind, and impress it

deeply upon your heart. The man who represents capital expects at all times to be considered as a *human being!* Why then should he not award the same consideration to the man who represents labor? Capital looks upon labor as a mere *commodity.* Is this manly? Is it right? Is it humane? Does not labor represent a *human being?* And is a *human being* to receive no greater consideration than a bag of wheat or a sack of flour? The idea of treating labor as a *commodity* was born in a rude and barbarous age, and should be stamped with the seal of disapproval by every honest man in the land. If the man who represents capital

cannot invest it to advantage, he is not obliged to invest it at all. And his capital will support him until he can invest it profitably. But how is it with the man who represents labor? Will his labor support him until it can be sold to advantage? I guess not. For him there is no alternative. He must sell his labor for what he can get for it or go hungry. This is all wrong, and if we are Christians, if we possess the feelings and qualities of true men, if we sympathize with those who are less fortunate than ourselves, and desire to do our duty towards our fellow-men, we must cease to treat labor as a *mere commodity*, and treat it

as a *human being!* Let it be understood henceforth and for all time to come, in this great and glorious republic, that we as Americans declare labor to represent a *human being* who is not to be treated as a *mere commodity*, but who must, in every instance, and in every sense, and under all circumstances be treated as a *human being!* To treat labor as a mere *commodity*, degrades it. If we would elevate and ennoble American labor, we must insist that it be stricken from the roll of commodities and be treated as a *human being!*

Every man who toils for a living should be paid fair wages. This is es-

sential to peace and prosperity. Fair wages will enable the wage-workers to buy homes, to live better, to wear better clothes, to obtain books for the improvement of their minds, and will make them better citizens and more competent workmen. And the increased consumption of these articles would increase the demand for labor and furnish employment to thousands of men. The wages of our skilled workmen are generally too low. According to the last census there are more than three millions of bachelors in the United States. It is safe to say that the majority of these bachelors are forced to remain single because of their

inability to support a wife and family on the wages they receive. No wonder so many of our married men feel discouraged because they are unable to save a portion of their wages to meet living expenses when they are idle. The wage-worker who is industrious and frugal, ought to be able to acquire sufficient means to protect himself against poverty in his old age. This he would be able to do if he received fair wages for his labor. But fair wages he cannot obtain. The result is that he finds himself poverty-stricken and helpless at a period in life when he should enjoy easy circumstances. While his employer lives in fine style, enjoys

all the comforts and many if not all of the luxuries of life, and then saves enough every year to make a poor man rich, the wage-worker trudges along unable to buy anything but the bare necessaries of life, and in the majority of cases is unable to save enough in a lifetime to put a roof over his head. And why is this? It is because the wage-worker is not paid fair wages. Why is it, that employers as a rule grow richer and richer, while the wage-workers who labor so hard save little or nothing? Is it not because the employers absorb all the profits on the products of labor? This is not right. It ought not to be so.

And the time has come when the wage-workers are going to demand and will insist upon having a more equitable share of the profits. The employer in the future must be content with smaller gains. His profits all along have been too large. Hereafter he must pay labor more and be satisfied with less himself. He shall have the lion's share of the profits on labor, but he shall not have it all! The skilled wage-workers of this country are thoroughly organized, and they intend to assert their rights and maintain them. And the sooner the employer understands this and makes up his mind to deal justly with them, the

better it will be for all concerned. The wage-workers to-day are too intelligent to submit to industrial slavery. They know what their rights are, and they mean to vindicate them at all hazards!

If you ask Mr. Good-talker, the manufacturer—who pays rather low wages to his men—why he does not pay his men better wages, he will tell you that he is doing business on a very small margin. That as a matter of fact, the profits in his business are so small that he scarcely makes anything at all. That to pay higher wages would bankrupt him! If higher wages were demanded, he would have to retire from business. He would

quit business at once if he could only persuade some one to buy him out. But such a thing is impossible. There is no money in the business, and nobody wants it. And he will tell you this in such an earnest, plausible, pathetic way, that you are inclined to believe all that he says, and really sympathize with him and look upon him as a truly good man, a philanthropist, who continues his business merely to afford employment to his men. But what are the facts? Mr. Good-talker is supporting an extravagant family at an annual expense of ten thousand dollars or more a year, the amount varying according to the size of his business and

income. He and his family dress elegantly, go to all the first-class operas and dramas, give costly entertainments, travel considerably, drink the finest wines and champagnes, set a sumptuous table, drive fine horses and carriages, enjoy all the comforts of life and many of the luxuries, and have a good time generally. After defraying all these expenses from his profits for the year, Mr. Good-talker usually has left ten to twenty thousand dollars to invest in profitable business enterprises. He is estimated to be worth to-day several hundred thousand dollars, while fifteen or twenty years ago he was a poor man. And every year he

is estimated to be worth more. Where did he get all his money? If the profits in his business are so small that he cannot afford to pay higher wages, how has he managed to accumulate all his wealth? If his income enables him to live extravagantly, and luxuriously, and still grow richer every year, where does the money come from? Do you know? If not, I will tell you. It comes from the products of labor! The wage-workers make it all!

If you ask Mr. Good-talker why it is that the profits in his business are so small, he will tell you that it is due to competition and over-production. There

is no doubt but that competition and over-production, for several years past, have caused a material reduction in the price of goods in many lines of business, but I have noticed that in almost every instance, when goods dropped in price, there was a simultaneous reduction in wages sufficient to make up the difference between the old prices and the new, so that the profits of the manufacturer remained unchanged, and the loss fell upon the wage-workers. Indeed, a slight reduction in the price of goods, or the introduction of a new piece of labor-saving machinery, is often made the pretext to reduce wages to a basis that will

increase the profits of the manufacturer. Over-production is the result of low wages. The wage-worker to-day does not earn enough to buy what he produces. Raise his wages and you immediately increase consumption. Pay him better wages so that he can buy what he wants, and our surplus goods will soon be consumed. When wages are high there is no over-production, and why? Because then the people have the money to buy all that is produced.

Mr. Good-talker says, however, that he would be only too glad to sell out if he could find a customer to buy his business. But you let a responsible party

make him an offer for his business, and see what he will say. He will proceed to convince him that the profits in his business are simply immense, and probably will refuse to sell out at all, unless the purchaser agrees to pay him a big bonus for the good-will of the business.

And still, if you tell Mr. Good-talker that you believe he is making money, he will deny the fact, and he will tell you that no one is making money to-day, that one-half of all the business men in the country are in a state of semi-bankruptcy, and to sustain his assertion he will call your attention to the large number of failures annually. Of course, there are a

good many failures every year, not only in this country but in every country. But these failures are not the result of paying fair wages to wage-workers. They are due to other causes. The facts in nearly every case will show that a considerable number of the men who fail in business are extravagant and live beyond their means. Many of them do not understand the business they are engaged in, and are ruined by trusting it to others. Some are addicted to dissolute habits and neglect their business. Others are poor financiers, feeble managers, inefficient in executive ability, and are utterly incompetent to carry on their busi-

ness or to conduct their affairs, and this is why they fail. During the last quarter of a century this country has produced more millionaires in proportion to its population than any other country in the world, and a good portion of these millionaires have made their millions out of labor. A list of all persons in the United States reputed to be worth a million dollars or more, was published in "The Tribune Monthly" for June, 1892. At that time there were four thousand and forty-seven "American Millionaires," one thousand one hundred and twenty-five of whom made their money mainly in protected industries. In France there

are not more than a dozen millionaires. In Germany there is but one. In Russia and India there are no millionaires at all, except a few titled gentlemen, whose fortunes were inherited through ancestors of royal blood, who originally obtained their wealth from the people by fraud and oppression.

The labor problem will never be settled in this country until the wage-workers are paid fair wages. We may fix the minimum rate of wages by law, but that is all it is practicable to do by legislation, because wages will always vary according to circumstances and the merits and skill of the wage-worker. Organized

labor must do the rest. And if the wage-workers will only pull together there will be no difficulty in their obtaining what they want.

But the capitalists say the wage-workers are a dissipated, improvident lot; many of them do not know what are fair wages; many of them are unappreciative; most of them bring their poverty and troubles upon themselves by indiscretion and recklessness, and that if you were to give them the earth they would not be satisfied. Well, admitting this to be true as to a *few* of the wage-workers, does not the imputation apply with equal force to a *few* of the capitalists? There

are just as good men among the wage-workers as there are among the capitalists. And there are men among both who are equally despicable. The majority of wage-workers are sensible, sober, honest men, who know when they are treated right, and they know very well what constitutes fair wages, and if they are paid fair wages there is no doubt but what they will be satisfied.

How then is the question as to what constitutes fair wages to be determined? This question must be decided by the mutual consent of the parties interested. And how are these parties to meet to discuss the matter? This is easily set-

tled. For instance, let the members of the Carpenters' Union of the city of Detroit get together, say about November first of each year, and discuss the question of wages. Let them agree among themselves upon a scale of wages for the ensuing year. Then let them appoint a committee to meet a committee to be appointed by their employers, to talk the matter over and fix upon a scale of wages for the year. And let the several trades-unions representing the different kinds of labor do the same thing. Then both the wage-workers and their employers will know what wages are to be for the following year, say from January first

to January first, and then the employers can figure on contracts for the year and adjust their prices accordingly. This ought to be agreeable to all concerned. And if this method is pursued each year there can be no trouble between employers and wage-workers as to the rate of wages to be paid, and strikes will soon become a thing of the past. This is the only way that the rate of wages can be amicably adjusted, unless boards of arbitration are established for that purpose. And this must be done every year. It is not practicable to do it otherwise. It is not right for the wage-workers to wait until their employers have made their contracts

for the year, and then demand a raise in wages. The raise in wages should be demanded before the contracts are made. There will then be no ground for complaint on the part of employers. And it seems to me this is not only a practical but a sensible way to settle the question of wages for the year. But the wage-workers will say, suppose the employers will not appoint a committee to fix the scale of wages, then what? This will indicate that the employers are not disposed to pay fair wages, and this being the case, let the wage-workers agree upon a scale of wages themselves, and then insist to a man that the scale must be

paid. If this is done, and the wages demanded are fair and reasonable, the wage-workers' course will meet with the hearty support of every good citizen, and the employers will be forced by public sentiment to acquiesce in their demand.

In England, disputes between capital and labor are amicably adjusted by what are known as joint boards of conciliation and arbitration. These boards have existed for many years, have been thoroughly tested, and are pronounced a great success. They are representative in character, and are composed of an equal number of employers and employees. Similar boards have been organized in Belgium,

and have given entire satisfaction to both the employer and the employed. In this country the methods adopted for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes by the Mason Builders' Association, the bricklayers' unions, and the Laborers' Union Protective Society, of the City of New York, the Chicago Masons and Builders' Association, and the United Order of American Bricklayers and Stone Masons, of the City of Chicago, the National Association of Builders, and the Mason Builders' Association, of the City of Boston, have attracted wide attention, and are likely to be adopted by most of the trades-unions. Those who desire to become familiar with

the various systems of these boards and joint committees of arbitration and conciliation, and the rules under which they were organized, would do well to consult "Industrial Conciliation," by Henry Crompton, and a more recent work on the subject by Josephine Shaw Lowell, entitled "Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation."

While the future of the farmers of this country begins to brighten, the future of the wage-worker looks dark and foreboding. During the last thirty years about one hundred millions of acres of land have been brought under cultivation in the United States. This has been the

means of reducing the price of farm products. But as the Government lands are about all gone, this will never occur again. Hence our surplus of food will gradually diminish, and with the rapid increase of population, farm products will enhance in value every year, and the cost of living to the wage-workers will steadily advance. So that unless there is a corresponding increase in the rate of wages, the struggle of the wage-workers for a subsistence will be much harder in the future than it is at present.

VI.—Reduce the Legal Rate of Interest to Four Per Cent Per Annum.

Reduce the prevailing high rates of interest, and you remove a great evil from our midst. Our business men, farmers, and wage-workers are unable to pay the present rates of interest and be prosperous. The payment of these high rates of interest has wrecked and ruined more men than almost any other cause. It has driven many a merchant out of business. It has been the means of many a farmer losing his farm. It has compelled many a wage-worker to throw up his

contract for the purchase of a home, after he had made his payments thereon for several years. No man should be obliged to pay more than four per cent per annum. This is all the law should require. It is all any man can afford to pay.

These high rates of interest tend to support high rents. If the rates of interest were reduced, rents would be comparatively lower. Rents are now fixed largely by the value of the property and existing rates of interest. The man who invests his money in rentable property, generally demands a rent on his investment equivalent to the prevailing rate of interest. To illustrate: If a man invests five thou-

sand dollars in a house and lot, he expects to rent it for a sum sufficient to pay the going rate of interest on his investment, and enough more to reimburse him for the taxes he pays and the cost of insurance and repairs. He then has the increase in the value of the property besides. Small tenements such as are usually rented to wage-workers, will generally pay such a rental, while property of greater value will not net the owner more than four or five per cent.

There are millions of wage-workers in this country to-day, who have purchased homes on contract or otherwise, who are paying from six to ten per cent interest

on the balance of the purchase price. This keeps them poor. It is a burden they are unable to bear. Many of them are obliged to deprive themselves of necessaries to pay it. Besides, it makes their homes cost them too much, and it takes all their savings during the best years of their lives to pay for them. To cut down the rates of interest one-third or one-half would make a big difference to our merchants, farmers and wage-workers.

Millions of our people have purchased stoves, sewing machines, furniture, and other articles, on contract, and in every instance they are obliged to pay these high rates of interest. So far as the

wage-workers are concerned, a reduction in these high rates of interest would be equivalent to an increase of wages, because it would permit them to save the amount of the reduction. It would bring about a material reduction in rents, and would reduce the rates of interest now paid by our municipal, state, and national governments, and thus prove a benefit to the taxpayers. The people would have more money to disburse for articles that require labor to produce. This would increase the demand for labor, and probably advance the rate of wages.

Most of the laws fixing these high rates of interest were enacted a good

many years ago, when money was scarce in this country, and it was necessary to offer some inducement to foreign capital to allure it to our shores. The necessity which gave birth to these laws has long since passed away. They are maintained to-day simply for the benefit of the brokers, bankers, real estate speculators, foreign capitalists, the people who rent property, and those who loan money. They are obnoxious to the masses of the people, are burdensome, and should be repealed.

VII.—Our Cities Should Own the Street Railways, and Run them for the Benefit of the People.

If all street railways were owned and controlled by the municipal authorities, they could be run for the benefit of the people. Nearly all of our cities supply the people with water, and have a Board of Public Works to superintend public improvements. Many municipalities have their own gas and electric light plants, and it would be an easy matter for all of our cities to buy up the street railways either before or at the expiration of their charters, and run them. The idea is per-

fectly practical, and the benefits which the people would derive from such a scheme is a good and sufficient reason for its adoption. Our cities should grant no more charters or franchises to street railway corporations. All new lines should be built and owned by the people. If our street railways were run by our cities, it is safe to say that they would be run upon a basis that would enable the authorities to reduce the fare to three cents and furnish transfers to any part of the city. It costs the people a large sum of money every year for street car fare, and this reduction in the fare would materially reduce their annual expenses.

It would enable the people to keep in their pockets a considerable sum of money which they now pay to the street car companies. So far as the wage-workers are interested, it would be equivalent to an advance in wages to the extent of the difference between the old fare and the new. Besides, this reduction in car fare would induce double the number of people to ride on the street cars, and this in turn would require a corresponding increase in the number of cars to carry them. This would necessitate the employment of double the number of street railway employees to carry on the increased business, and would afford work

to a large number of men to get out the materials for and build the additional cars that would be needed. Our cities would doubtless pay fair wages to their men, and this would put an end to street railway strikes.

VIII.—The Chief Telegraph, Telephone, and Railroad Lines Should be Owned and Run by the National Government.

The principal telegraph, telephone, and railroad lines in the United States are owned and controlled by a few men, who no doubt would sell them to the Govern-

ment at a reasonable price, and take Government bonds at a low rate of interest in payment for them. If the Government owned these lines the present rates of telegraphing and telephoning could be reduced at least one-half, and the railroad rates for carrying freights and passengers could be cut down to the actual cost of carrying them. If this were done what would be the result? Millions of dollars that are now paid to these lines annually, would remain in the pockets of the people. The business of these lines would more than double in a short time. This would necessitate the employment of twice as many people as are now hired to do

the work. Double the number of cars would be required to carry on the business, and this would give employment to thousands of men who are now idle, to get out the materials and build them. The cheap railroad fares would enable the wage-workers to migrate to points where labor was in greatest demand. And it is but reasonable to assume that the Government would pay the employees on these lines fair wages, and thus do away with strikes. Besides, the time has come when it is necessary that these lines should be owned and controlled by the Government. Emergencies are apt to arise not only in time of peace, but in

the event of an invasion by a foreign foe, and in moments of great political excitement such as lead to intestine war, when the private ownership of these lines might prove a menace to the life of the nation. The railroads of the country have become a mighty power in the land. Their annual revenue amounts to more than double that of the Government. And they employ from six to ten times as many persons to carry on their operations. That the scheme is a practical one there can be no doubt. The management of railroads by the Government has been made a success in Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and several of

the smaller German States; also in Austria, Prussia, Hungary, and Russia, and in some of the Australian Colonies.

It is a well known fact that the dividends of many of our railroads to-day are small. Some of them do not pay dividends at all. And railroad stocks as a rule are undesirable. Hence this is a good time to buy them. With the increase of our population there will be an increase of business on all the railroads in the country, and it will not be many years before railroad stocks will be as desirable as the stock in a national bank. It will then be difficult to purchase them.

If the Government is to ever own these lines, now is the time to buy them.

Those who desire to know all about the railway problem, will find it to their advantage to read "National Consolidation of the Railways of the United States," by George H. Lewis. This is the latest publication on the theme, and it discusses the whole subject from a legal, political, social, and financial standpoint. It is a very interesting and instructive work. It submits a plan for the consolidation of all our railroads, which if adopted, would place them under the supervision of the National Government,

while the railroads themselves would be owned and controlled by the people.

The telegraph lines in Switzerland, and England, are owned by the Government. In 1880 the telegraph lines in England, notwithstanding rates are much lower there than they are in the United States, earned $300,000 over and above all expenses, which amount was turned into the public treasury.

IX.—Land and Non-Resident Aliens.

Millions of acres of land have been purchased in this country by non-resident aliens for purely speculative purposes. The idea is to hold these lands for a few

years and then put them upon the market at prices that will net the owners ten times their original cost. These lands cannot be bought until the owners are ready to sell them, and then the purchasers must pay the owners their price for them. And thus our citizens are deprived by foreign speculators of the opportunity to purchase these lands until they are ready to sell them. Is this right? Ought such a thing to be tolerated under the law? Is not this an imposition upon our citizens? Is it not time that our people should be afforded protection against alien speculators? Shall we permit this thing to continue until the

price of lands is so high that not more than one out of a hundred of our people are able to buy them? And all this for the benefit of a lot of alien speculators who have about as much interest in the welfare of this country as the Hottentot has in the welfare of Michigan? This is a shame, and it should be stopped at once. If these lands were thrown into the market to-day, tens of thousands of our citizens who are living in our cities would purchase and live upon them. This would decrease the population of our over-crowded cities, and give employment to thousands of men who are now idle and suffering for the want of work. Be-

sides, thousands of men would find employment on these lands, to work and develop them. It seems to me that it is high time that our law-makers opened their eyes to the situation and adopted active measures to protect our citizens against this sort of speculation. A law should be enacted by Congress prohibiting the purchase of lands by non-resident aliens, and requiring all non-resident aliens who now own lands to dispose of them within a specified time, or in default thereof, forfeit their titles.

The Conclusion.

There are many other equally important matters which call for legislative action, but these measures alone, if carried into effect, would afford labor the relief desired. They would stimulate a demand for labor on the one hand—that would exhaust the present superfluous supply—and cut off the foreign supply on the other. Labor as a commodity would enhance in value, and wages would steadily rise. These changes would afford ample protection to labor, and provide work for all. And my experience and observation has led me to the conclusion that when

there is plenty of work for the masses, at fair wages, and reasonable hours, the masses are content and prosperous. But when work is scarce and wages low, with millions of men seeking employment in vain, discontent prevails, and peace and prosperity vanishes.

Of course, there are constitutional impediments to some of these changes, but constitutions unsupported by public sentiment may be amended or abrogated at the will of the people who made them. The masses of the people can rule if they will. The majority of the people have the power to make and unmake laws. If the people are only determined

in their purpose they can accomplish their ends. When the masses can control by their votes the State and National Legislatures, the millenium will not have been reached, but there will be the dawning of a brighter and happier day when the people of the country, through their representatives assembled, shall assume the responsibility of clearing up the many and intricate difficulties which obstruct the solution and final adjustment of the labor question.

We are living in a corrupt and venal age. The old political parties are in the hands of machine-made politicians, who are ready to sacrifice everything to obtain

the spoils of office. The scramble for political power and its emoluments is a disgrace to the nation. All that party leaders seem to contemplate is party victory. Even the influence of the Government is utilized to further party interests. And the chief object of our statesmen is to provide good comfortable positions for political wire-pullers. And in order that these statesmen may not go wrong, they have adopted the following rules for their guidance: First, look out for yourself, and do all you can to promote your own personal welfare. Second, after you have done all you can for yourself, do your utmost to advance the best interests of

your party, because in so doing you are advancing your own personal interest. And third, after you have done what you can for yourself and your party, if you can do anything for the people without putting yourself to any inconvenience, why do it, but not otherwise. These rules do not promise much to the people. Were it not for the patriotism and honesty of a few reliable men who are looking after the affairs of the nation, our Government would soon collapse into a state of dissolution. Every legislative body in the country is controlled to-day by unscrupulous, self-preferred, machine-made politicians. They assume to

represent the people, but they are not the people's chosen representatives. Money and political corruption has placed them where they are. Had the people had anything to say about it, scarcely one of them would be holding the office they occupy. Most of them care as little for the interests of the people as they do for the heathen Chinese. All they care for is the political machine. The American people will rise up in all their might some day and smash these political machines into smithereens. And it is hoped that the day when this will be done is near at hand. If the American people wish to preserve the integrity and honor

of the nation, it will have to be done soon. When men of merit and ability and brains, who are qualified in every particular to represent the people, are rudely brushed aside to give preference to the machine-politician, and the man with the "barrel of money," it is time for the American people to pause and consider the situation. There is one thing at least that we should bear in mind, the downfall of a nation is always preceded by a marked decline in public morality.

The United States Senate to-day is composed principally of millionaires. If this office was an elective one, as it

ought to be, nine out of ten of our present senators would soon be returned to private life. The men who are chosen for this office generally, by the State Legislatures, are not the choice of the people, nor are they such men as the people want. The Senate cannot be abolished, but its members may, and should be, elected by popular vote. The corrupt methods used to obtain this office is demoralizing and scandalous.

No man can expect to be nominated for Congress to-day, unless he contributes a large sum of money to a corruption fund to secure his election. Dishonesty and trickery permeates our whole political

system. The political "bosses" run our caucuses, run our conventions, dictate who shall be nominated for all the offices, and after they have made up *their tickets*, they kindly condescend to invite the people to vote for them. The men who are elected to legislative offices, as a rule, are the tools of the political "bosses," and the "bosses" in turn are the tools of moneyed men who make liberal contributions to the campaign funds. As a result, all legislation is in favor of the moneyed classes, and the masses of the people get nothing. These political "bosses" have systematically reduced the people to a state of political slavery, suf-

ficiently humiliating to cause the blush of shame to mantle the cheeks of every true American.

Examine the congressional records for the past twenty-five years, and what will you find? Laws for the protection of manufacturers; laws for the protection of banks; laws for the protection of monopolies; laws for the protection of trusts, syndicates, railroads, corporations, and the rich people generally. But you will find no laws for the protection of labor. No laws for the welfare of the masses. No laws for the protection of the weak and helpless. You will find plenty of laws for the benefit of the few, but none for

the benefit of the many. All legislation has been class legislation. Legislation for the purpose of granting special privileges, legislation for the promotion of party interests, and legislation for political revenue only. The lands of the people have been frittered away and have passed beyond their control. Fifty millions of acres of public lands have been granted to States and corporations since 1850 to aid in building railroads. The Union Pacific Railroad alone received a grant of twenty-three millions of acres. And altogether, about two hundred and fifty millions of acres of the people's lands have been given away, principally

to railroad corporations. This being the situation, is it not time that the people woke up and found out where they are? Evidently:

"Wrong rules the land, while waiting Justice sleeps."

Mr. James Bryce, a member of Parliament, in his work entitled "The American Commonwealth," says: "The whole machinery, both of the National and State Governments, is worked by the political parties. Parties have been organized far more elaborately in the United States than anywhere else in the world, and have passed more completely under the control of a professional class. * *

Politics, considered not as the science of government, but as the art of winning elections and securing offices, has reached in the United States a development surpassing in elaborateness that of England or France, as much as the methods of these countries surpass the methods of Servia or Roumania. * * * The civil service in America is not a career. Place-hunting is the career; and an office is not a *public trust*, but a means of requiting party services. In the Federal Civil Service there are about 120,000 places. Politics in America are, in fact, a squabble over offices and jobs. * * * The politicians have the spirit of self-interest

to rouse them, and the bridle of fear to check any stirrings of independence. They are organized in rings which are dominated by 'Bosses.' What the client was to his patron at Rome, what the vassal was to his lord in the Middle Ages, that the leaders and workers are to their 'Boss' in the great transatlantic cities, where Ring-and-Bossdom has attained its amplest growth, overshadowing the whole field of politics. * * * Toil for the public good is usually unfruitful in the House of Representatives. * * * But toil for the pecuniary interest of oneself and one's friends is fruitful. The Senate has become, practically, an assem-

bly of plutocrats. Some are Senators because they are rich; a few are rich because they are Senators." Mr. Emerson, in his "Essays," tells us: "The President has paid dear for his White House. It has commonly cost him all his peace and the best of his manly attributes. To preserve for a short time so conspicuous an appearance before the world, he is content to eat dust before the real masters, who stand behind the throne." Mr. Lowell, in his "Essays on Government," says: "The American politician is a member of an army of office-seekers, whose warfare is waged chiefly with a rival warfare of office-seekers, and the

spoils of victory, in the form of public offices * * * are allotted strictly to the officers who have organized and disciplined these voters—to persons more vulgarly called the workers or wire-pullers of the party." Mr. Henry George, in his "Social Problems," says: "In many cities the ordinary citizen has no more influence in the government under which he lives than he would have in China. He is, in reality, not one of the governing classes, but of the governed. * * * The political 'Boss' makes a business of gaining power and then selling it." Mr. W. S. Lilly, in his essay on "Self-Government," cleverly re-

marks: "This is the source of the immeasurable corruption of public life in the United States, for the 'Boss' is, as a rule, utterly venal; he regards and uses power merely as a way to wealth." And so I might go on *ad infinitum*. But I will not weary the reader. The independent press both at home and abroad, the magazines, the reviews, and the current literature of the day, denounce in the most emphatic and scathing terms the corrupt and demoralizing methods employed by the horde of unscrupulous wire-pulling politicians who run our government.

And thus it is, that the American

people are disgraced before the world by the scandalous conduct of a swarm of political demagogues, who have taken possession of the government and control it in their own interest, to the detriment of the people. The greatest evil that the American people have to contend with to-day—an evil that threatens the very life of the Republic—is *party government.* Our national government is no longer a representative government; it is no longer a government calculated to insure "the greatest happiness of the greatest number"; it is no longer "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." On the contrary, it is essentially

a *party government*, run by a multitude of professional politicians and *party* "*Bosses*," in the interest of *party* and an army of office-seekers. The political machine-made "bosses," the political wire-pullers, the political demagogues, the professional office-holders and office-seekers of the old political parties, are not only irredeemably corrupt in their political methods, but their perfidious and dishonest practices are rapidly demoralizing the flower and youth of the land. For this condition of things there is but one remedy. Every loyal American citizen who loves his country more than he does his party, should at once make war on this army

of politicians and "Bosses," and never rest until every one of them—horse, foot and dragoon—are relegated to private life, and their places filled with competent honest men.

> "Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions and a will,
> Men who have honor, men who will not lie."

When this has been done, the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitutions of the several States, should be amended so as to make it obligatory on our law-makers to submit all important legislative enactments to the people for their approval. This would enable our citizens to make their own laws; it would

prevent class legislation; it would do away with jobbery and corruption in our legislative assemblies; it would purify our system of politics; it would give us fewer and better laws; it would give us a government that would afford "equal rights to all men, and special privileges to none," and above all, it would destroy *party government* root and branch.

This method of law-making would involve no new principles. In Switzerland the laws have been made directly by the people, through the Initiative and Referendum, for more than a quarter of a century. Direct legislation and local self-

government are familiar doctrines to the American people. As a rule, the constitutional laws of the States can only be changed by a vote of the people. The State Constitutions provide for a multiplicity of legislative measures that can only become laws by the sanction of the people. Our township governments, as they exist to-day in New England, and in parts of Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska, Minnesota, Dakota, and other States, are run upon the principles of the Initiative and the Referendum. And so are many of our cities and counties. In Michigan, about forty amendments to the State Constitution have been submitted to the peo-

ple since 1850. In reality, the principles of the Initiative and Referendum permeate our whole system of government, town, county, municipal, and state, and are to be seen in operation to some extent, in some form or other, in almost every State in the Union.

The power of the law is almost infinite. With the enactment of beneficial laws, and the aid of an honest judiciary to enforce them, labor can accomplish its aims and secure its rights. The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the realm, and can be abolished or amended at the will of the people. And the first thing to be done if we are to

make any progress towards the betterment of the condition of labor, is to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to invest Congress with the power to enact laws as follows: To suspend all further immigration to this country; to make eight hours a legal day's work; to prohibit marriage under the age of twenty-one years; to forbid the employment of children under fifteen years of age in workshops, factories, and mines; to fix the minimum rate of wages at two dollars per day for all laborers except domestic and farm laborers; to reduce the legal rate of interest to four per cent. per annum; to create three new departments

of government, to be known as the Railroad Department, Telegraph Department, and Telephone Department, each department to be authorized, upon certain conditions and under certain restrictions, to purchase the principal railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines in the United States, to be paid for in government bonds, and to prohibit the purchase of lands by non-resident aliens, and compel non-resident aliens who now own lands in the United States to sell them within a reasonable time, to be specified by law, or forfeit their titles.

There are many reasons why it is not practical for the States to legislate on

these subjects. The States have no power to stop immigration. If they pass laws, as many of them have done, making eight hours a legal day's work, they are unconstitutional, and cannot be enforced. If Ohio should reduce the rate of interest to four per cent. per annum, capital would withdraw to other States. If Michigan alone were to fix the minimum rate of wages at two dollars per day, she would be overrun with labor. If Illinois were to prohibit non-resident aliens from buying and holding lands, aliens would buy lands elsewhere. If New York were to forbid marriages under the age of twenty-one years, people would go

to other States to marry. Hence it will be seen, that it is absolutely necessary that Congress should be empowered to legislate on these questions, so that the laws may be uniform and binding on all the States.

Mr. Ely, in his admirable work on the "Labor Movement in America," cleverly says: "There are four agencies through which we must work for the amelioration of the laboring class, as well as of all classes of society. These are the labor organization, the school, the state, and the church." Yes, these are all good, all necessary, all essential to the welfare and happiness of all classes of society, not

only now, but at all times. But what we need most of all to-day, is the enactment of laws that will afford immediate relief to the masses.

I am not a millennialist, and if I was I would not wait for the millennium. I believe in doing to-day whatever can be done to ameliorate man's condition. We should not sit down and permit the evils we complain of to multiply. If we have discovered the cause of these evils, and we know the remedy, the remedy should be applied at once. If legislation is the remedy, then let us proceed to procure such legislation as may be necessary to

afford us the desired relief. Above all things let us shake off the lethargy of the past, and assume an active aggressive policy, one that will enable us to accomplish something.

There is one thing that labor should always bear in mind, and that is, that capital is invariably represented by men of courage, men of ability, and men of large brains. The men who represent capital are usually men of consummate tact, men of influence, men of stability. Their standing and character must be such as will command confidence and respect. Capital will not employ mediocrity, nor permit itself to be represented by

a rambling, incoherent, blatherskite. In this particular it would be well for labor to emulate the example of capital. Labor, as a rule, is not represented by men of sufficient calibre and native strength and ability, to cope with the men who represent its adversary. If labor is to succeed in its efforts, it must be represented by men who are able to contend with its opponents in any emergency.

If the wage-workers will only make up their minds to help themselves, something practical can be accomplished. Every wage-worker who has a vote should use it to his advantage. The power of the ballot is irresistible. With

this weapon the wage-workers can obtain their rights. What we need most of all, is thoroughly competent, honest men, to represent the people in legislative, judicial, and executive offices. Every man who is nominated for a legislative, judicial, or executive office, should be made to publicly announce his views on the issues involved, and pledge himself to support them. If he refuses to do this, then the wage-workers should use every means in their power to defeat him. If this were done, it would not be long before the wage-workers would have a sufficient majority in both houses of the State Legislatures, and of Congress, to

enact such laws as are necessary to relieve their wants. Labor as an organization should refrain from nominating men for any office, except those I have mentioned, because the men who hold these offices are the only men who possess the power to promote the cause of labor. Their positions enable them to give labor something in return for its support, while the men who are elevated to city, county, and state offices, can help no one but themselves. Besides, to put men up for other offices, simply affords an opportunity for ambitious, office-seeking individuals, to gratify personal desire, and advance their personal interests, at

the expense of organized labor. To pursue this course would divide the labor vote and defeat its object. As to whether or not it would be wise for organized labor to start an independent party, is a serious question, and one upon which the men who are best qualified to express an opinion do not agree. My own idea is this: In a political contest, in the cities at least, organized labor, as a unit, wields the balance of power, and for this reason labor ought to have no difficulty in getting one of the old political parties to nominate its candidates for Congress, and the Legislature. In return, labor could well afford to indorse the whole ticket of

the party that nominated its congressional and legislative candidates. Should this plan fail, there would be no alternative, and labor could then put an independent ticket in the field.

In politics, the wage-workers should ignore party and religion and nationality. They should see that good reliable men are nominated in every instance. And their chief aim should be to elect the men who represent them. They should not however, select all their candidates for office from the ranks of labor. This has been tried, and has uniformly resulted in defeat. Labor in this respect must be reasonable. Suppose the farmers were

to insist that none but farmers should be nominated for legislative offices? Would it not be natural for the rest of the people to object? The wage-workers themselves would reject such a proposition as unfair and ridiculous. There are plenty of good business men, and plenty of good lawyers, who are ready to espouse the cause of labor if an opportunity is afforded them. Some of these men should be chosen as labor's candidates. The fact that they do not belong to any labor organization would redound to labor's benefit, and give greater force to anything they might say in labor's behalf. The candidates of labor for legislative offices,

should not be taken exclusively from any particular class; they should be selected from all classes, and should constitute a thoroughly representative body of men. Some of them should be men of cosmopolitan ideas and broad views. And all of them should be men of unquestionable integrity, and brains and ability.

There are thousands of ministers, doctors, lawyers, business men, and capitalists, in the United States, who sympathize with labor, and would willingly advance its aims and objects. But to them the doors of labor organizations are closed. It is hoped however, that labor will devise some means

to secure their co-operation. The influence and support of such men would be a great help and a great power. It is this class of men that labor needs to advocate its cause among the people, outside of the ranks of organized labor. If labor unions were to provide for the election of a limited number of honorary members, each labor union throughout the entire country could procure the services and influence of many of these men, by merely electing them as honorary members of the union.

The object of confining labor's efforts to the nomination and election of men for legislative, judicial, and executive of-

fices, is this: The men who are elected to legislative offices, make our laws; those who are elected to judicial offices, construe them, and those who are elected to executive offices, enforce them. The President of the United States, and the Governors of the several States, exercise the vetoing power, and the State Legislatures choose our United States Senators.

The only means by which the wage-workers can ever expect to obtain their rights and improve their condition, is organization and legislation. If help does not come from these sources it will never come at all. All the substantial benefits gained by labor during the last twenty

years, not only here, but in England, may be safely attributed to organization and legislation. The wage-workers' watchword should be organization and legislation. The wage-worker who anticipates assistance from any other source is laboring under a delusion. These are the fountains from which relief must flow. It is important, therefore, if the wage-workers desire to attain their ends, first, that they keep thoroughly organized, and second, that they concentrate all their strength and exhaust all their efforts to secure the nomination and election of honest, competent men, to legislative, judicial, and executive offices. If this were

done, they would ultimately achieve success, and their efforts would be crowned with victory!

If the Constitution of the United States were amended so as to empower Congress to enact the laws I have suggested as a remedy for existing evils, it is manifest even to the dullest comprehension, that the poverty that now prevails would rapidly disappear and prosperity would soon reign. The adoption of these measures would furnish employment to the idle, shorten the hours of labor, and secure fair wages for all who are industrious and willing to work. It would give dignity and stability to American labor. It

would do away with strikes and lock-outs, and bury forever the bitterness and hatred that now predominates between capital and labor. It would encourage industry and frugality, give new life and hope to the oppressed, and afford relief to the distressed. It would brighten the homes of the unfortunate, cheer and comfort the needy, carry joy to the hearts of despondent mothers, and kiss the tears of hunger from the eyes of children who cry for bread.

This is a beautiful world. Banish avarice from it, and misery and want would soon disappear. Avidity generates discontent. Magnanimity produces felic-

ity. Humanity alone is the remedy for all the evils that environ us. Our resources are superabundant. There is more than enough to clothe and feed us all. Why then should any one suffer for food to eat or raiment to wear? Is it not because many of us are too selfish? Is it not because many of us unjustly retain too large a portion of the products of labor? Is it not because many of us are insensible to the wants and necessities of the masses? We are not going to live here always, and when we die we can take nothing with us. While we are here we should live and let live. Let us do unto others

as we would have others do unto us. Let us give every man an opportutity to live decently and comfortably. Let us gladden the hearts of those who are struggling for happiness. The time has come when we can afford to be more just and generous. Why make slaves of the multitude, that the few may revel in luxury? Let us do something to alleviate the condition of the wage-workers. Let us do something to diminish the poverty and distress that surrounds us. Let us do something to lift our fellow-men above the dismal plane of hunger and want. Labor has cleared our forests, developed our country, created our national wealth,

built our princely stores and palatial homes, surrounded us with all the comforts and conveniences of life, and caused the fruits of the earth to blossom like the rose. Surely, labor is worthy of some consideration. The wage-workers are our brothers; they belong to the same great human family; they are made of flesh and blood like ourselves; they have similar minds and hearts; they possess the same appetites and the same passions; they feel an injury as keenly as we do; they live under the same starry heavens and worship the same God, and they are equally as quick to resent a wrong or

appreciate a kindness. In our dealings with the wage-workers let us be manly and honest and humane. This will give us their respect and confidence, and bring peace and prosperity to all. And when the good work is done, those whom we love will evince their gratitude in expressions of joy, and God will bless us for all eternity.

CHAPTER IV.

THERE IS NO COMPLETE REMEDY FOR POVERTY.

"Poverty is the only burden which is not lightened by being shared with others."

The condition of the masses in our large cities to-day is something appalling. Poverty and distress meet our vision on every side. The appeals of the poor, the murmuring of the idle, and the cries of the afflicted, are heard on every hand, while grim despair, like a storm cloud, hovers o'er the squalid homes of the hungry and oppressed. Just how all this suffering and misery is to be relieved, no

one seems to know, and no one has suggested a remedy that affords us a glimmer of hope that relief will ever come. Several schools of political and social reformers have arisen, and each of these schools has proposed a remedy for poverty, which it claims is the only true one. All of these remedies contain some good ideas, but for some reason or other they are all considered objectionable or impracticable, and have so far borne no fruit. All the remedies thus far proffered appear to be inadequate and powerless. In fact, there seems to be no remedy equal to the emergency. Henry George however, informs us in his work entitled

"Progress and Poverty," that he has not only discovered the cause, but the remedy for poverty. And as no man living has thought more earnestly on the question than Mr. George, let us pause for a moment and briefly examine his views.

"Progress and Poverty" is certainly a very remarkable book. It is unquestionably the most original, aggressive, and radical contribution to economic literature that has appeared since the publication of "The Wealth of Nations." Its thought is warm and animated, its arguments clear and comprehensive, and its conclusions logical and powerful. It is the work of an enthusiast endowed with

brains and genius. As a literary production it is lofty and grand. Considered as an intellectual effort, it is veritably a masterpiece of logic and reason. The extensive acquaintance of the author with literature, science, arts, and even fiction and fable, is something unusual. Indeed, it would be impossible for any one to read this most extraordinary work without appreciating and admiring the eloquence, the wonderful power of illustration, the intense earnestness, the deep thought, and the intrepid courage of the author. And nowhere does Mr. George allow his zeal in the cause which he espouses to carry him to those extremes which are born

of passion and prejudice, and which are only calculated to weaken the effect of the most meritorious works. In all that he has to say in the examination and interpretation of the questions involved in his subject, he is moderate and dispassionate, but emphatic and logical to the end. And yet, notwithstanding all this, the author advocates doctrines which are detrimental to the best interests of society and subversive of good government. If "Progress and Poverty" were simple enough to be read and understood by the masses, its influence would have a tendency to disturb the equilibrium of the social fabric, and perhaps incite rebellion

against the individual proprietorship of land. But the work is altogether too intricate ever to be read or comprehended by the great masses of the people. It is a book that will be perused almost exclusively by men of thought and culture, who are thoroughly competent to estimate its value, and who will naturally reject every principle which it inculcates that is unsound and vicious.

Mr. George exhibits a perfect familiarity with the current views of the ablest writers on political economy and the principles of the science upon which they all agree, as well as the questions upon which there is a wide

difference of opinion, but he seems to care but very little for their conclusions. Many of the economic theories of Adam Smith, Ricardo, Malthus, Buckle, John Stuart Mill, and others, are analyzed and refuted as easily as a fog is dispelled by the warm rays of the morning sun. And when this has been satisfactorily accomplished, Mr. George starts out on a course of reasoning of his own, and arrives at results which are at once interesting and instructive, and which are propounded with a force and eloquence which not only persuade and enrapture the reader, but animate him with a feeling of profound admiration for the consummate

skill, the subtle ingenuity, and the sublime logic of the author.

Mr. George shows that the natural order of the three great factors of production is land, labor, and capital, and avers that instead of starting from capital, as our initial point, we should start from land. He demolishes the popular theory adhered to by so many of the most distinguished writers on political economy, that wages are drawn from capital, and demonstrates, beyond all controversy, that labor simply draws a part of what it produces, leaving the balance to capital, and clearly indicates that capital is neither disturbed nor drawn from by wages at all.

There is one exception to this rule however, which Mr. George seems to have overlooked, and that is, in all cases where capital is furnished to pay labor, before labor is productive, and capital is lost, then it is obvious that labor draws from capital. With this exception, he manifests beyond doubt, that labor always adds to capital by its exertion, before it takes from capital in its wages. He explodes the idea that wages depend upon the ratio between the amount of labor seeking employment, and the amount of capital devoted to its employment, and shows that it is obviously untrue, that capital is relatively abundant where

wages are high, and relatively scarce where wages are low. He refutes the theory of Ricardo, and Malthus, that population may outrun subsistence, and that the wages of labor may be measured by the price of commodities. He illustrates the fact, that want and squalor appear where productive power is greatest, and the production of wealth is the largest. He does not believe in the Malthusean theory, that the increase of population tends to reduce wages, and produce poverty. He assigns the increase of rent as the chief cause of low wages, and argues that the cause of poverty and famine in Ireland, India, and China, is not due to over-

population, but to misrule, the imposition of rack-rents, and the tyrannical oppression of the people into a condition of helpless and hopeless degradation. He believes that coöperation will not remedy the grievances of the working classes, and that if coöperation were universal it could neither raise wages, nor relieve poverty. He argues that trades-unions and labor combinations are not only inefficient, but destructive of freedom and wealth, and inevitably tyrannical, and that labor-saving machinery or improvements have a tendency to increase rent, without increasing wages, and have failed everywhere to benefit the laboring classes.

And thus he ranges with majestic stride through the whole field of political economy, disputing, step by step, many of its best established principles, overleaping the boundary lines of every fixed rule, and upsetting well adjusted generalizations, formulas, and theories, by a line of argument that is not only irresistible, but irrefutably brilliant. And upon the ruins of these antiquated theories of political economy, he builds up a new and marvelous system, which is destined to make him famous in the annals of economic literature.

And it makes no difference whether we resort to the inductive or deductive methods

of reasoning. The same conclusions are reached by either method. But I do not acquiesce in Mr. George's views upon all the questions which he discusses. His main object is to show, that material progress not only fails to relieve poverty, but that it actually produces it, and that there is but one remedy that will eliminate this torturing evil from our midst. I intend to demonstrate that he is not only wrong in this theory, but that the reverse is the case; that material progress does not produce poverty, but on the contrary, it actually diminishes it, and that the remedy which he suggests to eradicate poverty, is in fact, no remedy at all.

It is undoubtedly true, that poverty and material wealth co-exist, but this does not prove that the former is the product of the latter. Because if this be admitted, it logically follows, that poverty must exist everywhere in exact proportion to the accumulation of material wealth, and this is not true, and never has been. Poverty is nowhere to be found in precise proportion to the existence of material wealth. And it is an indisputable fact, that poverty existed in greater abundance before the inception of material progress, than it does to-day. Poverty is of ancient origin. It was born of antiquity, and still lives. Material progress is the child of

modern civilization. The former flourished for centuries before the latter was born. Primitive man came into the world poverty-stricken and helpless. For ages poverty was universal, now it is confined to a minority of the people in all civilized countries. The advance of civilization and material progress has greatly ameliorated man's condition. They have lightened his burdens and softened the enormity of his sufferings. For centuries, man lived in caves, bark shanties, and mud huts. His original condition was that of the half-starved omnivagant tatterdemalion. Material progress has provided

him with superior shelter, clothed his nakedness, satisfied his hunger, and surrounded him with every convenience, comfort, luxury, and enjoyment. And while poverty is more keenly felt perhaps, in our day, by those who are hampered with it, than it was in former times, this is imputable to the fact, that formerly, all men were poor and thought less of their poverty and misery, because all suffered alike, while to-day, the contrast between the luxurious status of the rich on the one hand, and the poverty of the poor on the other, enable the latter to realize more bitterly their deplorable condition. But when we consider, that originally all

men were poor, and that material progress has gradually lifted a large portion of mankind from an impoverished state to one of opulence and ease, it seems to me that it is idle to say, that material progress has failed to relieve poverty, or that it produces it, when all the facts tend to show, beyond dispute, that poverty has not only been relieved, but diminished by its growth.

If there never had been any progress in material wealth, poverty would have prevailed, and all mankind would have been doomed to a life of misery and insufferable want. If man had invented anything there would not have been material

wealth enough in existence to have put it into use. Man would have always remained a ragamuffin and lived in a state of semi-barbarism for the need of all of those great inventions and discoveries which material progress has cherished and developed, and which have done so much to promote the welfare of man and advance civilization. There would have been no steamboats, no railroads, no telegraphy, no telephone, no machinery, no agricultural implements, no public improvements, and the arts and sciences would have been comparatively unknown. In short, the world would have been at a standstill, man would have made but

little if any progress, and would always have lived like a pauper and a semi-savage. The increase of material wealth has done far more than any other one thing to elevate man to his present high estate, and to develop, educate, and civilize him.

Poverty has always existed, and still exists, except as it has been diminished by the progress of civilization and the growth of material wealth. It exists in old countries, and it exists in new countries. It exists in rich countries and in poor countries. It exists in densely settled countries and in sparsely settled countries. And the United States present,

perhaps, the best evidence in the world to show that it is not produced by material progress, but by other and more subtle causes. Poverty exists in the United States, a country where wages are comparatively high, where many of the poor are becoming rich, and where land is superabundant.

The fact is, material progress produces the opposite effect claimed by Mr. George. Material progress does not produce poverty; on the contrary, it actually diminishes it. As man accumulates material wealth, his poverty ceases. And the great problem to be solved by the philanthropist, the philosopher, and the states-

man, is, why it is, that material progress diminishes poverty up to a certain point and then ceases? That is to say, material progress improves the condition of all the people up to a certain point, and then, the increase of material wealth falls into the hands of a few!

In the United States, poverty exists principally in the large cities, and is mainly attributable to *enforced idleness*, *low wages*, *high rents*, *and extortionate rates of interest*, the minor causes being indolence, extravagance, intemperance, and vice. This will be obvious to even the most casual observer. Nearly every case of poverty can be traced either directly or

indirectly to one or more of these causes. It is true that modern civilization and material progress have transmuted the various forms of poverty just as they have changed our manners and habits, but they have neither produced nor increased poverty, which in all human probability will continue to exist, to some extent at least, to the end. Material progress has been to man what the sun is to vegetation, it has warmed, nurtured, and sustained him. To stay its advance would be like taking the light from a delicate flower and shrouding it in darkness.

That the condition of the laboring classes in England has been greatly

improved during the last fifty years, notwithstanding the immense growth of material wealth during that period, is evidenced by Mr. Giffen in his work entitled "The Progress of the Working Classes in the Last Half Century." Mr. Giffen's figures tend to show, that during that time the individual incomes of the working classes have largely increased; that the prices of the main articles of their consumption have declined; that the rate of mortality has decreased; that the consumption of articles in general use has increased; that there has been a general improvement in education, a diminution of crime and pauperism, a vast

increase in the number of depositors in savings banks, and many other evidences of their general well-being. And in an excellent article written by Prof. Laughlin, and published in the *North American Review* for May, 1884, it is shown that labor-saving appliances, machinery, and increased production, have not only not been the cause of the wretchedness, the misery, and the distress, which exists among the working classes, but that they have actually been the means of employing more labor, increasing wages, and ameliorating the laboring man's condition.

I am well aware of the fact, that some of the statements made by Mr. Giffen,

relative to the improved condition of the working classes in England during the last fifty years, have been doubted, merely because they do not harmonize in all respects, with the views expressed by Mr. Huxley in his "Social Diseases and Worse Remedies," and the observations of Mr. Verinder, published in the London *Church Reformer*. While Mr. Sullivan in his "Political Aspects of the Labor Problem," questions the accuracy of some of Mr. Giffen's figures. But notwithstanding these differences of opinion, Mr. Giffen's statements have never been refuted. Besides, it is an indisputable fact, that the wage-workers in England, and Amer-

ica, are not only paid higher wages, but their condition generally, is much better than the condition of the wage-workers anywhere else, and yet, the increase of material wealth in these countries during the last quarter of a century, has been greater than in any other two countries in the world.

The saying that the "rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer," is not true. If it were—if the poor became poorer in proportion as the rich became richer—one-third of the human race would soon be in the poorhouse. The fact is, *some* rich men are becoming richer, while *some* are becoming poor. On

the other hand, *some* poor men are becoming rich, while others are either making no progress at all, or they are gradually becoming poorer. On the whole, the number of rich people are increasing, but as they increase from the ranks of the poor, it logically follows that the number of the poor are constantly becoming less. The men who live in opulence and ease to-day, are liable to be bankrupt and poverty-stricken to-morrow. No man can govern the vicissitudes of fortune, any more than he can control the wind or stay the storm. And all things considered, it would seem as if a large portion of mankind were doomed to a life

of toil and suffering, owing to their want of economy and the frailty of their natures. The unequal distribution of the material wealth of the world has undoubtedly caused many a bitter thought, many a heartache, many a pang of sorrow, suffering and despair. But for this there is but one remedy, and that every man possesses. Men who are industrious, economical, and temperate, accumulate property. Those who are not, generally remain poor. And herein lies the whole secret. The sooner this fact is realized and acted upon the better. If a more equitable distribution of the world's wealth could be permanently secured by the

adoption of constitutional laws, statutory provisions, or national treaties, the remedy would be very simple, and man could soon be made comfortable; but as this is not only impracticable, but impossible, man must depend upon his own resources and help himself. This is his only remedy.

No doubt, an advance in wages, an amendment to our National Constitution fixing eight hours as a legal day's work, a reduction in rents and the present rates of interest, would have a tendency to reduce poverty in the United States to a minimum. Other remedies for the evil, would be a radical change in morals and the present mode of living, increased

intelligence, and a diminution of indolence, extravagance, intemperance and vice, among the laboring classes. Higher wages would provide the working classes with the means to secure homes and enjoy many of the conveniences of life which are now beyond their reach; a reduction in the hours of labor would furnish employment to any who are idle, and afford the laboring classes ample time for moral and intellectual improvement. This of course, would reduce the profits of capital, but it would cause a more equitable distribution of the products of labor, and would prevent capitalists from accumulating immense fortunes in a few

years by wrongfully depriving labor of its natural rights and just rewards.

But Mr. George not only adheres to the theory that material progress produces poverty, but he gives us a remedy for the evil:

1. "We must make land common property."

2. "Abolish all taxation save that upon land values."

Mr. George proposes to take the land from its present owners without compensation, the people to resume the ownership of the land as common property, allowing the land-owners to simply retain

their improvements. Mr. George's views upon this question are far more radical than are those of Amos, Moody, Spencer, and others, who believe that the owners of land should receive full indemnity for it. Mr. George claims that in order "to extirpate poverty, to make wages what justice commands they should be, to substitute equality for inequality, plenty for want, justice for injustice, and social strength for social weakness," and to remedy all the evils which naturally flow from poverty, that individual ownership in land must be speedily abolished.

Precisely how all this would be accomplished if Mr. George's remedy was

adopted, he does not indicate, and nobody will ever be able to discover by reading his book. The man who can provide a practical, complete, and permanent remedy for poverty, will always be respected and honored as one of the greatest benefactors of the human race. We might say of such a remedy, "'tis a consummation devoutly to be wished," but one which is no more likely to be realized than were the fantastic imaginings of Don Quixote, or the fanciful dreams of Sir Walter Raleigh, in his fruitless efforts to discover the fabulous El Dorado. When the statesman, and the philosopher, shall have exhausted their wisdom in the ad-

justment of the labor problem; when the theories of Amos are accepted, and empirical politics are reduced to a science; when men shall have become perfect, and the millennium is at hand; then indeed, may we hope to see poverty and all its insufferable pangs suppressed, and the wolf driven from the poor man's door. But there is just about as much probability of these things coming to pass, as there is in the world being destroyed by lightning when the sky is cloudless and the sun stands in the meridian.

There are several fatal objections to this remedy:

1. It is unconstitutional.

2. It is impracticable.

3. It is revolutionary.

The remedy is unconstitutional, for the reason that the Constitution of the United States provides, that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, and that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

It is impracticable, and revolutionary, for the reason that the property owners would never submit to any such outrage, unless they were compelled to do so by military force. And if military force were resorted to, they would defend their vested rights to the last man. This would only

be natural. The tiniest worm that crawls will turn if stepped upon. Nothing short of a successful revolution could possibly enforce such an odious measure, and a revolution begun for the perpetration of such a gigantic piece of robbery, would inevitably end in ignominious defeat. A revolution in support of such a measure, might under certain circumstances, meet with success in a country like Great Britain, where the land is all owned by a few persons, but in the United States, where the land owners and those who entertain the same views upon the question are so numerous, any attempt to enforce it would prove a ridiculous failure. Besides, no

remedy that limits personal liberty, that retards material progress, that obstructs superior financial ability and requires retrogression, can hope to escape oblivion. The whole tendency of the age is to advance. Never before has the human mind been more active or perspicacious, and no remedy that is so utterly barren of the primordial elements of progress as the one proposed by Mr. George, however ably advocated, will ever stand the test to which it must submit before it is adopted, and therefore must signally fail. It is impossible to ignore this fact. It is as apparent as sunshine, and as irresistible

as the tide of the ocean, with its variable currents and boisterous waves.

But, even if we waive the constitutional objection to Mr. George's remedy, and admit for the sake of argument, that it is practical and non-revolutionary, if carried into effect it would have a tendency to produce the very evil which Mr. George aims to eradicate. In the United States, his remedy, instead of diminishing poverty, would actually produce it. It would take away from millions of honest, industrious, and economical farmers, mechanics, and laborers, their farms and homesteads, and would give them nothing in return—farms and homesteads that represent the

savings of nearly a lifetime. It would not only thereby reduce them to poverty, but it would compel them to pay rent in the bargain; while on the other hand, it would in no way put a dollar in the poor man's pocket, neither would it increase his wages, nor relieve the poverty which now prevails. To carry out this remedy would simply be to add poverty to poverty, to stay the growth and accumulation of wealth in real property, to destroy every incentive among men to be industrious and economical, to rob man of his energy and ambition, to ignore an individualism and inequality which Nature herself inviolably sanctions, to encourage

idleness and vagrancy, to increase intemperance and vice, and to corrupt good morals and demoralize society generally.

So much for the reduction of land to common property. Let us now ascertain what the result would be if all taxation were abolished except that upon land values.

If we make land common property and abolish all taxation save that upon land values, if the taxes are not paid how are they to be collected? They could not be enforced against the land, for the land would in such case belong to the State, and not to the taxpayer. So that if the taxpayer did not own personal property

enough to make him responsible, the tax could not be collected. The only remedy for this evil would be to require the occupant of the land to pay his taxes in advance. But suppose he could not do so, then what? This rule would favor the rich and oppress the poor. The rich would have the means to pay the tax, but where would the teeming millions of workingmen get the money to pay a year's tax (rent) in advance? And what would become of all the unoccupied lands which now pay taxes? Under the proposed system they would produce no revenue, for they could not be taxed if not occupied. This of course, would necessitate the im-

position of a heavier tax upon the lands occupied! So that under this system the Government would be supported solely by the occupiers of the land. And as the great majority of the occupiers of the public domain would be poor people, this would virtually impose the maintenance of the Government upon the poor. If this system were adopted, the millionaires of personal property would be entitled to the same protection under the law as the poor taxpayer, without having to pay a tax upon their property. The Government is now supported principally by the rich. Under this system, Mr. George would reverse the rule, and give us a

Government supported by the poor, for the benefit and protection of the rich, and this he would do in the name of justice, to remedy the evil of poverty and eliminate it from our midst.

While I am opposed to any interference with the proprietary rights of the present owners of land, I believe that the law should prohibit all persons from purchasing and holding more land than is *actually necessary for homestead and business purposes.* This would prevent the purchase of land for speculative purposes.

Under existing conditions, I believe that the adoption of a tax law, similar to that recently enacted by the Parliament of

New Zealand, would cause a sudden decline in the value of land, and a substantial reduction of rents. A tax law that would exempt from taxation all improvements on land to the amount of five thousand dollars, impose a graduated tax on all lands—including improvements—of the value of twenty thousand dollars and upwards, and levy an additional tax on absentee landlords, would not only place the burden of taxation on the rich, but it would prove a great boon to the masses of the people.

Of course, there is nothing novel in the remedy suggested by Mr. George. It is purely socialistic in principle and char-

acter, and is based upon the doctrines of Proudhon, Fourier, Lasalle, Owen, and other Socialists. It was sanctioned by the Paris Commune, and ratified still later by the valiant Moody. The appearance however, of "Progress and Poverty" and "Land and Labor" marks an epoch in the growth of the science of political economy, and the progress of radical thought as developed by Socialism. There seems however, to be a serious lack of consistency between the Socialists here and abroad, and the situation now presents to our vision, the highly interesting spectacle of Socialism advocating the adoption of constitutional rights,

through the revolutionary party in Russia, and the destruction of constitutional rights, by George, Moody, and others, in the United States.

The State Socialists advocate the doctrines of Lasalle, Hyndman, and Burns. They would abolish our present system of government and establish a Coöperative Commonwealth. They would make all the products of labor common property, and have all the business affairs of the country, both industrial and commercial, carried on by the Government. The Socialistic Labor Party entertains the same idea. The Communists go still further, but fortunately, they are divided

among themselves. The compulsory Communists believe in the principle of authority and a government. The anarchistic Communists believe in a free society, but would have no government at all. All Communists however, believe that all property should be held in common by the people. The Anarchist believes in the absolute sovereignty of the individual, but just how his dreams are to be realized we are not informed. The Anarchists have no program. They disagree on almost every point with the Single Taxers, the State Socialists, and the Communists, especially on the land question.

Then we have the Republican and Democratic parties, and half a dozen other political organizations, all nobly struggling to solve the vexatious problem. And still the world moves on without a practical remedy for poverty. The various remedies tendered by these political and social reformers are warmly and tenaciously supported by a brilliant array of writers and speakers and thinkers. And while there is some sense in all of the remedies proposed, there is also a good deal of nonsense, and in the clash of ideas between George and Mallock and Marx and Lasalle and Gronlund and Bellamy and Tolstoi and McKay and Warren and

Proudhon, and the impracticability of a variety of remedies, there is to be found neither consolation nor hope for suffering humanity. And with all these remedies on our hands, there is nothing but talk, nothing but discussion, nothing but wind music to amuse and pacify the masses; while idleness and poverty and oppression sweep over the land like a devastating storm, leaving their victims to perish by the wayside, for the want of the necessaries of life.

And all the remedies that have been offered for poverty, are not only revolutionary in character, but altogether too complicated and cumbersome to be practi-

cable. In my judgment the remedy for poverty does not require revolutionary measures at all. There is no necessity for a change in the form of our government. The government is all right, it is the men who are running it who are wrong. These we must change. If our Constitution and laws are defective they can be amended to meet the emergency. If the different schools of social and political reformers have presented any good ideas, they can easily be formulated into laws and engrafted upon our present system. The theories and nonsense of these reformers we do not want. Their good

ideas we can and should adopt by suitable legislation.

It seems to me that the time has arrived when a practical move in the matter should be made. If legislation is the true remedy for poverty, we should set ourselves to work and see that such laws are enacted as will afford us the relief desired. The thing of all things is to do something. If we are ever going to accomplish anything let us be about it. Why put off until to-morrow what can be done to-day? When capital wants a law enacted for its protection, or to further its interests, it goes direct to our lawmakers and requests that such a law be

passed, and it is passed. Why cannot labor do likewise? If the wage-workers ever expect to improve their condition, they must make known their wants and make an effort to secure them. I have pointed out the remedy for the present needs of labor. All that remains to be done is for the wage-workers to say to our law-makers, these things we want and must have, and they will obtain them. If any member of Congress, or any member of the State Legislature, neglects or refuses to do his duty, relegate him to private life, and put another man in his place.

It is all well enough for these reform-

ers to indulge in nice subtle discussions as to the correctness or incorrectness of the Malthusian theory; to inform us of the cause of high rents; to expatiate upon the high rates of interest; to lay down the law of wages; to explain the relations between capital and labor; to expound the law of supply and demand; to denounce the idea of coöperation; to indicate the cause and progress of poverty; to deplore the tendency to concentrate the ownership of land; to elucidate the evils and advantages of labor-saving inventions; to condemn monopolies and trusts; to illustrate the effect of taxation on production; to talk artfully and learnedly

about the different theories of a score or more of distinguished writers upon a multiplicity of economic topics; to discuss the equation of values; to argue that land should be made common property; to dilate on the increase of material wealth; to lament over the inequitable distribution of property; to picture the great productive power of nature; to dwell sympathetically upon the injustice of modern civilization; to propose a remedy for poverty that is too refined and intricate for the masses to understand, and to describe in the most graphic and glowing terms the enchanting beauties of an ideal, but incomprehensible commonwealth; but all

of these rose-tinted discussions, though instructive and highly interesting, will not furnish work to the idle nor fill the mouths of hungry men. They will not provide men with food to eat, clothing to wear, nor a roof to cover their heads. What we need is something more substantial and practical; something to relieve labor's present necessities; something that will end labor's grievances; something that will supply labor's wants; something that will bring joy and comfort to the hearts of those who toil to earn their daily bread.

The true remedy for poverty, so far as there is any remedy at all, *is steady work*,

shorter hours, and fair wages. All the influence that labor possesses, and every exertion that labor has the ability to make, should be concentrated and exhausted, in one mighty effort to obtain these three things. Supply the wage-worker with these, and his troubles will soon fade away.

Man is doomed to a life of toil. "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread." This is the eternal law. No man can live unless he works. Nothing can be achieved without labor. All the schemes devised by man to the contrary have failed. The earth will not bring

forth her fruits without it. And all that we possess comes from the soil. "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." And the saddest thing of all is, no matter how hard we work, no matter what we do, there will always be more or less poverty. The paralytic, the superannuated, the sick, the lame, the blind, the insane, the improvident, and the unfortunate poor, we will always have with us. Man may, by industry, by economy, by the enactment of beneficial laws, and in various other ways, ameliorate man's condition, and diminish poverty to a point where there will be but very little suffering and want,

but that is all that man can ever expect to accomplish. All this talk about a complete remedy for poverty is arrant nonsense. There never has been, there is not now, and there never will be, a complete remedy for poverty. The man who believes in such a remedy is a dreamer. The man who hopes for such a remedy will never live to realize his hopes. All the remedies for poverty that man has ever conceived, are either impracticable or inadequate. Poverty is here to stay. It may be possible to bail out the ocean, or to snatch the sun from the sky, but to eradicate poverty from our

midst is impossible. Poverty may be reduced to a minimum, it may be relieved, but it can never be extirpated. Man and poverty are twin brothers. They were born in the same womb, rocked in the same cradle, and will float down the stream of life to a common grave. Here, and here only, all poverty will end.

"Death ends our woes,
And the kind grave shuts up the mournful scene."

These views may be discouraging—they may seem pessimistic—but for this I am not responsible. They are the honest convictions of one who has long and earnestly searched for the truth, who has

carefully studied the subject in all its bearings, and given due thought and consideration to all the questions involved, and are based upon conclusions and facts that are supported and affirmed by the history of man in all ages.